

## REMARKS

It is not clear as to whether the amendment to the Title in the Response of Sept. 8, 2004, has been entered, as subsequent papers from the PTO still indicate the prior Title. If the amendment has not yet been entered, applicant kindly requests that the amendment to the Title be entered at this time.

Claims 37, 38, 40-43, and 45-55, 58-61 and 65-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The rejection relates specifically to the limitation in claims 37, 48, 59 and 65 “within the proximal-distal and medial-lateral boundaries defined between respective adjacent peg holes.” The Examiner believes that language can be interpreted as a hole overlapping a hole. In order to overcome the rejection, the Examiner has suggested amending the claims to state that the proximal-distal and medial-lateral boundaries of the peg holes be defined with respect to edges of such peg holes. The applicant appreciates this guidance from the Examiner and has incorporated this suggestion into claims 37, 48, 59 and 65.

It is noted that, according to the Response to Arguments at page 8, the amendment to overcome the § 112 rejection also overcomes all rejections over the cited art.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance of the case is earnestly requested. Should any issues

remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David S. Jacobson', written over a horizontal line.

David S. Jacobson  
Reg. No. 39,235  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.  
60 Long Ridge Road  
Suite 407  
Stamford, CT 06902  
Ph: 203-323-1800

September 4, 2008